

Kinetic energy of uniform Bose-Einstein condensate

E. E. Nikitin¹ and L. P. Pitaevskii²

¹ *Max-Planck-Institut für Biophysikalische Chemie,
Am Fassberg, D-37077, Germany and Department of Chemistry,
Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, 32000, Israel*

² *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Trento and BEC Centre,
INFN-CNR, Via Sommarive 14, I-38050 Povo, Trento, Italy;
Kapitza Institute for Physical Problems, ul. Kosygina 2, 119334 Moscow, Russia.*

The Bogoliubov theory of a uniform weakly-nonideal Bose-Einstein condensate leads to a divergent expression for the kinetic energy of atoms. However, the latter can be determined provided that the dependence of the scattering length on atomic mass is known. The explicit expressions are derived for the kinetic energy through parameters that specify interatomic interaction. The kinetic energy of condensate atoms noticeably exceeds the total energy. Numerical data are presented for ⁸⁷Rb and ²³Na condensates.

The Bogoliubov theory of a weakly-nonideal (dilute) Bose-Einstein condensed gas is known to provide a quite good description of its properties [1], permitting, in particular, calculation of the total energy E of the gas in the ground state. However, the Bogoliubov approach can not be used for the calculation of the total kinetic energy, the important property of a condensate. Indeed, the distribution function of atoms out of condensate at large momenta p reads $N_p = (4\pi\hbar^2 a n)^2 / p^4$ where n is the gas density, and a is the scattering length of slow atoms (see, e.g. [2], Sect. 4.3).

Therefore, the total kinetic energy K , defined as the integral $K = \int \frac{p^2}{2m} N_p \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi\hbar)^3}$, diverges as $\int dp$. This means that K is governed by small interatomic distances, of the order of the interatomic potential range r_0 , where the Bogoliubov theory is inadequate. The total kinetic energy is an important quantity that characterizes the interaction, and in principle, it can be measured (see comments at the end of this letter). The calculation of this quantity is of considerable theoretical interest along with the total energy (note, that for an ideal Bose gas at $T = 0$, both E and K vanish). We emphasize however that we are speaking here about an uniform gas in which the kinetic energy is due to the presence of atoms outside the condensate. This is a non-mean-field effect. A condensate in a trap possesses also kinetic energy due to its inhomogeneity, which can be described by the mean-field theory.

In order to calculate the kinetic energy integral, one should use a microscopic approach that explicitly takes into account properties of interatomic interaction. This can be done, for $T = 0$, by resorting to well-known formula that relates K to the derivative of E with respect to the mass of the atom, m , viz: $K = -m (\partial E / \partial m)$ (see [3], Problem to § 15). For the energy density (the energy per unit volume) one can use the first-order Bogoliubov expression $E = 2\pi\hbar^2 n^2 (a/m)$ which is valid under condition $na^3 \ll 1$ (n is the density of atoms). In this way we get:

$$K = -2\pi\hbar^2 n^2 m \frac{\partial(a/m)}{\partial m}, \quad \frac{K}{E} = -m \frac{\partial \ln(a/m)}{\partial m}. \quad (1)$$

It is thus seen that K can be calculated provided the de-

pendence of a on m is known. Notice that positiveness of the kinetic energy implies inequality on this dependence, $\partial(a/m)/\partial m < 0$. A simple example corresponds to atoms simulated by rigid spheres, when a does not depend on m . In this case $K = E$, which is expected for this example.

We begin from another simple, but instructive model. Let potential of interaction of atoms can be presented as a spherical square potential well of radius R and depth U_0 . Then we have for the scattering length

$$a = R - \frac{\tan \kappa R}{\kappa}, \quad (2)$$

where $\kappa = \sqrt{mU_0}/m$ (see [4], Problem 1 to § 132). Simple calculations give

$$\frac{\partial(a/m)}{\partial m} = -\frac{1}{2m^2} [3a + R\kappa^2 (a - R)^2]. \quad (3)$$

For a shallow well, when $\kappa R \ll 1$, we find

$$\frac{\partial(a/m)}{\partial m} = -\frac{2U_0^2 R^5}{15\hbar^4} \text{ and } K = \frac{12\pi\hbar^2 n^2 a^2}{5m} \frac{a^2}{R}. \quad (4)$$

In this case $K \ll E$ [5]. The non-zero value of the kinetic energy arises only in the second Born approximation. An interesting situation takes place when $\kappa R \approx (N - 1/2)\pi$, where N is a positive integer, and when the last term in the r.h.s. of Eq.(2) makes the main contribution to the scattering length. This is a case, when the well has a level with small binding energy, N is the level number. Then $a \gg R$ and one gets from (3):

$$K = \frac{\pi^2 \hbar^2 n^2}{m} (N - 1/2)^2 \frac{a^2}{R}. \quad (5)$$

For a more realistic case when the interaction between atoms is described by a smooth potential $U(r)$ with a well, the mass dependence of a can be calculated within the quasiclassical approximation. The latter is valid, when the number of levels N supported by the well is large and when the standard quasiclassical approximation for

bound states close to the dissociation threshold is corrected for a "nonstandard" matching of the WKB solution in the well with a quantum solution in the region of the outer turning point [6]. For our case, the potential in the region of outer turning is just a van der Waals potential $-\alpha/r^6$ where α is the van der Waals constant. A relative corrections to this approximation are of the order of $1/N$, and we consider $1/N$ as a small parameter of our problem. For alkali dimers, N is of the order of 100.

The quasiclassical expression for the scattering length reads [6]:

$$a = a_0 (1 - \tan \Phi) \quad (6)$$

where a_0 is the "mean" scattering length

$$a_0 = 0.48 \left(\frac{m\alpha}{\hbar^2} \right)^{1/4} \quad (7)$$

and Φ is the corrected quasiclassical phase integral

$$\Phi = \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{r_i}^{\infty} \sqrt{-2mU(r)} dr - \frac{\pi}{8}. \quad (8)$$

Here r_i is the inner turning point that corresponds to the classical motion with zero energy (the energy here is referred to the dissociation threshold). Under the quasiclassical conditions, the phase Φ is large and is related to N as $\Phi = \pi N + O(1)$. Eq.(6) shows a very strong variation of the scattering length upon a change of the phase integral by the increment of the order of unity. This is expected since the scattering length is a sensitive function of a position of the upper, real or virtual, energy level supported by the potential well, see [4], § 133. In the calculation of the derivative $\partial a / \partial m$ we can therefore ignore a weak mass dependence of a_0 as given by Eq.(7) and take into account the dependence of Φ from Eq.(8) only. After simple derivations we get

$$K = \pi^2 \hbar^2 n^2 N \frac{a_0}{m} [1 + \tan^2(\Phi)] = \pi^2 \hbar^2 n^2 N \frac{a_0}{m} [1 + (a/a_0 - 1)^2] \quad (9)$$

Eq.(9) simplifies when the scattering length noticeably exceeds the "mean" scattering length a_0 , that is in the case of the resonance scattering on a weakly bound state. (Notice, that Bose-Einstein condensate is stable only if $a > 0$. Hence the level must be a real one.) For $a \gg a_0$ Eq.(9) assumes the form

$$K = \frac{\pi^2 \hbar^2 n^2 N a^2}{m a_0}. \quad (10)$$

The appearance of a large factor N in the expression for the kinetic energy, Eq. (9)-(10), reflects the acceleration of relative motion of a pair of atoms in the potential well. We note that the difference between N^2 and N behaviour of K in Eqs. (5) and (11) comes from the fact

that a square well and a realistic potentials show different pattern of convergence of the energy levels to the dissociation limit. For any realistic potential, the energy levels converge to the limit in such a way that the spacing between them decreases as $\sqrt{-E}$, where E is the energy (negative) counted from the dissociation limit [7]. The square well does not show this behaviour, since even for high values of N the bound state is not completely quasiclassical because of non-quasiclassical behavior of the wave functions close to the walls.

From Eqs.(9) we get the following expression for the ratio of the kinetic to total energy:

$$\frac{K}{E} = \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{N a_0}{a} [1 + (a/a_0 - 1)^2]. \quad (11)$$

This expression determines the K/E ratio via the scattering length a , "mean" scattering length a_0 and the number of bound states N . Two latter quantities, a_0 and N , characterize the microscopic parameters of the Bose-gas, in addition to the Bogoliubov "macroscopic" parameter a . Rough estimations of N for diatomic molecules can be done using the model of the Morse potential, $N = 2D/\hbar\omega_e$ where D is dissociation energy and ω_e is the small-amplitude frequency of vibrations of a molecule. Using data from [8] we get $N = 135$ and $N = 74$ for $^{87}\text{Rb}_2$ and $^{23}\text{Na}_2$ respectively. Accepting these values for N , calculating a_0 from (7) with $\alpha(\text{Rb}_2) = 4770$ a.u., $\alpha(\text{Na}_2) = 1540$ a.u. (see [8]), and borrowing a from [9], [10], we get $a_0 = 79a_B$, $a = 109a_B$ for ^{87}Rb and $a_0 = 43a_B$, $a = 52a_B$ for ^{23}Na . Finally we find $K = 176E$ for ^{87}Rb and $K = 100E$ for ^{23}Na .

It follows from (9)-(11) that the kinetic energy increases with a faster than the total energy does, and K can be much more larger than E . (The mean-field kinetic energy of inhomogeneous condensate is always less than the total energy.) In this case, the absolute value of the total potential energy, $|V| = |E - K|$, also exceeds E , so that the total energy emerges from delicate balance of two large quantities which almost cancel each other. However, it should be taken into account that an increase in a , which happens when the last bound state approaches dissociation limit, is limited by the condition of a dilute gas, $na^3 \ll 1$. Under this condition, the total potential energy per atom is still much lower than the potential well depth. It is easy to show for the square well model. Indeed, for an dilute gas, one can conclude from (5) that $|V|/n \sim K/n \sim U_0(R/a) \ll U_0$. Note that the kinetic energy actually always exceeds E , because the potential energy is negative. Thus the positive total energy results at the expense of the kinetic energy.

Large values of scattering amplitude have been reached in experiments near Feshbach resonances [11, 12]. However in this case one has the "two-channel situation", when the resonance level is created by weak interaction between closed and open channels. This situation demands more careful theoretical considerations, which will be presented elsewhere. Notice only that the mass dependence of a for Rb isotopes was investigated numerically

in [13]. The kinetic energy of the condensate can be, in principle, measured. Indeed, according to [14] the dynamical formfactor $S(\omega, q)$ of the condensate for a large enough momentum transfer q yields the momentum distribution; integration of this distribution allows one to calculate the kinetic energy. It might be more convenient to use the moments $m_n(q)$ of the formfactor, $m_n(q) = \int \omega^n S(\omega, q) d\omega$. As shown in [16], one can derive K from the asymptotic behavior (for $q \rightarrow \infty$) of m_2 or m_3 .

The dynamical formfactor of the condensate was first measured in [17] by the two-photon Bragg spectroscopy. However, this method does not permit to get information on the momentum transfer of the order of $\hbar/a_0$ which is necessary to recover the kinetic energy. One can get information on large values of the momentum transfer from neutron scattering data. In this way the kinetic energy of atoms in liquid ^4He was measured (see, for example, [15]). However, this kind of experiments is difficult due to low density and small dimension of gas. More promising are experiments with scattering of fast atoms by condensates as discussed in [18]. Notwithstanding all difficulties,

these types of experiments would open new important perspectives of investigation BEC at the atomic level.

This theoretical approach can be also compared with results of the Quantum Monte Carlo calculations. First calculations of the kinetic energy were presented in [19]. The authors used a model with the delta-potential interaction and kinetic energy they calculated was related to the gas inhomogeneity in a trap. However, it is possible to perform such calculations for a realistic potential.

In conclusion, we have calculated the kinetic energy of a uniform Bose-Einstein condensate in its ground state. This quantity, which diverges in the Bogoliubov theory, is determined by the microscopic properties of a dilute condensed gas: the dependence of the scattering length on the atomic mass. Different possibility of measurement the kinetic energy of the condensate are discussed.

We are grateful to S. Stringari who introduced us into the title problem, C. Wieman, S. Kokkelmans for constructive comments and B. Marcellis for information about his unpublished results. LPP acknowledges support from JILA in frame of the JILA Fellowship.

-
- [1] N. N. Bogoliubov, J. Phys. USSR, **11**, 23 (1947).
 - [2] L. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari, *Bose-Einstein Condensation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.
 - [3] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics, Part1*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1980.
 - [4] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1987.
 - [5] To ensure condensate stability, one must consider in this case a potential "hump" of height U_0 instead of the well. Eq. (4) is valid also for this model.
 - [6] G. F. Gribakin and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A **48**, 546 (1993).
 - [7] R. Côté, E. I. Dashevskaya, E. E. Nikitin, and J. Troe, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 012704 (2004).
 - [8] A. A. Radzig and B. M. Smirnov, *Reference Data on Atoms, Molecules and Ions*, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1985.
 - [9] H. M. J. M. Boesten, C. C. Tsai, J. R. Gardner, D. J. Heinzen, and B. J. Verhaar, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 636 (1997).
 - [10] E. Tiesinga et al., J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol. **101**, 505 (1996).
 - [11] J. L. Roberts, N. R. Claussen, J. P. Burke, Jr., C. H. Greene, E. A. Cornell, and C. E. Wieman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5109 (1998).
 - [12] S. Inouye et al., Nature **392**, 151 (1998).
 - [13] B. Marcellis, Master's Thesis, Eindhoven University of Technology (2003).
 - [14] P. C. Hohenberg and P. M. Platzman, Phys. Rev. **152**, 198 (1966).
 - [15] J. Mayers, C. Andreani, and D. Colognesi, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **9**, 10639 (1997).
 - [16] F. Dalfovo and S. Stringari, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 13991 (1992).
 - [17] J. Stenger et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4569 (1999).
 - [18] A. B. Kuklov and B. V. Svistunov, Phys. Rev. A **60**, R769 (1999).
 - [19] W. Purwanto and S. Zhang, e-print, cond-mat/0506219.